

75

T. G. MASARYK

By OTAKAR MACHOTKA
CORNELL UNIVERSITY

PUBLISHED ON THE OCCASION OF
T. G. MASARYK'S CENTENARY
BY COUNCIL OF FREE CZECHOSLOVAKIA,
WASHINGTON 1950

10/6
1.50

OTAKAR MACHOTKA : T. G. MASARYK

T. G. MASARYK

OTAKAR MACHOTKA

OTAKAR MACHOTKA

OTAKAR MACHOTKA

OTAKAR MACHOTKA

OTAKAR MACHOTKA

12054/44

T. G. MASARYK

By OTAKAR MACHOTKA
CORNELL UNIVERSITY

PUBLISHED ON THE OCCASION OF
T. G. MASARYK'S CENTENARY
BY COUNCIL OF FREE CZECHOSLOVAKIA,
WASHINGTON 1950

Czechs, Slovaks and democratic men wherever they are will stop for a moment this March 7, 1950 to remember one of the world's leading democratic thinkers and leaders, and the greatest man in modern Czech history, Thomas Garrigue Masaryk. That day will be the hundredth anniversary of the birth of the man who was to be the first president of the Czechoslovak republic, and whose name was to become the synonym for democratic statesmanship throughout the world. On March 7, 1850, Thomas Masaryk was born in Hodonin, a Moravian town, to a poor coachman and his wife, a former serving maid. On March 7, 1950, the people in his homeland remember him as a symbol of their lost liberty and independence, and they and the whole democratic world are drawing on his heritage in the struggle against totalitarianism.

Thomas Garrigue Masaryk was a great man, a great thinker and a great leader. Professor of philosophy and sociology at Charles University for more than a generation, he became the liberator and creator of the only real democracy in central and eastern Europe, and assumed its presidency at the age of 69. He was one of the prime factors in destroying one of the mightiest and oldest political powers in Europe, and after the First World War led his country and Europe through seventeen troubled years. During these years of moral and political leadership he probably came closer to being a wise philosopher-ruler than any leader who lived since Plato first set up his high ideal.

THE MAN AND HIS LIFE

Masaryk's growth to greatness began at the bottom. As a youth, the poor youngster was first apprenticed to a blacksmith, but his great intellectual drive impelled him to leave the trade and undergo great hardships to study at an Austrian gymnasium (Junior College). He succeeded brilliantly and came out first in the class. At the Brno gymnasium he had repeated conflicts with professors, keeping firmly his personal convictions even against the authoritarian head-master. Finally he had to leave and graduated at the gymnasium in Vienna. Then he studied at the Philosophical division of the University of Vienna, where he received his Ph.D. in Philosophy in 1876, and was given the rank of "docent" in 1879. When in 1882 the old Charles University in Prague established a Czech and German branch, he was appointed to the new chair of philosophy and sociology at the Czech branch. He held this position for thirty-two years, and at one time or another taught most of the leading Czech philosophers, social scientists and teachers who were to become leaders in the new republic.

In 1877 he met a young American woman, Miss Charlotte Garrigue, in Leipzig, where she was at the time studying art. They fell in love and married shortly afterward in New York (1878).

His wife soon found a place with the world's greatest thinkers. She was a great source of inspiration to the young professor, and probably the most influential person in his life. She not only helped with his great amount of work, and bore and raised the four Masaryk children (one of whom, Jan, was killed shortly after the Communist coup d'état of February 1948), but also directly influenced his political and moral aims. Partly under her influence Masaryk became a Protestant, renouncing the Catholicism which had brought him much emotional unrest during his youth. He developed a deep personal religiosity which deviated strongly both from the formalistic concepts of the contemporary Czech Catholics and the fashionable free-thinking of the intellectuals. His creed combined the passion for truth of Jan Hus, the 15th century Czech religious leader who was burned at the stake as a heretic, the humanitarianism of the Czech Brethren and the practical religiosity of American Protestantism. His wife was also probably partly responsible for shaping the practical and active character of his philosophy, and for strengthening his strong democratic convictions.

The personal influence of his wife was augmented by Masaryk's frequent contact with the democracy of the Anglo-Saxon countries. He visited England the U. S. A. several times. In 1878, he came to the United States to visit his sick fiancée; in 1902, he taught at the University of Chicago.

The outstanding characteristic of Masaryk's personality is, in my judgment, his unique attitude toward truth. He was a passionate seeker, revealer and defender of truth. In this respect it is difficult to find an analogy with him among the philosophers and politicians of modern times. Masaryk adhered so strictly to the truth that, for instance, after four years of conflict against Austria-Hungary he was able to say that during all this difficult campaign not one word of untruth had been used. A specific example of adherence to the truth is contained in his behavior when he visited a strife-torn Moscow during the Bolshevik revolution. Arriving at the door of the Hotel Metropol he found the walls spattered by machine-gun bullets and the porter with strict orders to admit only guests of the hotel. When the porter brusquely demanded whether he was staying in the hotel, he did not lie but simply told the man, "Don't be a fool, and let me in," and surprisingly enough was admitted without further difficulty.

Perhaps even more unusual than Masaryk's own adherence to truth was the eagerness with which he sought out instances where the cause of truth was endangered, no matter whether this occurred within his field of interest or not. Although many men seek truths in specialized fields, men like Masaryk who seek it everywhere for its own sake are rare indeed. Truth was a constant challenge to Masaryk wherever it was concealed, suppressed and unknown. In 1899, for instance, a tremendous furor was stirred up in Prague by the court trial of one Hilsner, who was accused of murdering two young girls for the purpose of using their blood in the Jewish religious rites. This fiction appealed to the feelings of a good part of the population, but Masaryk examined the entire question and proved the ritual myth to be the nonsense that it was. Masaryk helped Hilsner despite the strong public resentment which was raised against him, and despite the fact that the case was far removed from his personal and professional interests. This impulse to defend truth for its own sake was again made evident when in 1909 he once more appeared in court to defend fifty-three Croat intellectuals and peasants who were accused of high treason on the basis of forged documents, and he personally brought the case before the Austrian

parliament. Soon after he again entered the public arena to expose as forgeries documents published by Dr. Friedjung, the official Austrian historian, which purported to prove high treason against a group of Serbs.

Masaryk's continual search for truth and exposure of falsehoods led him to many conflicts in his own country too. These included literary conflicts, difficulties with the University authorities (reproof from the academic senate), conflict with Catholic priests (and a resulting action of 360 priests at the court), criticisms of student life which brought on student demonstrations against him, and other conflicts. Perhaps outstanding is his personal crusade against the *Dvur Králové* and *Zelená Hora* manuscripts, clever forgeries, which appealed to popular nationalism by purporting to prove the existence of a well-organized Czech state and high literary culture at the beginning of the Middle Ages. His attacks on their validity aroused nation-wide protests, and he was many times called a "national traitor". Masaryk however remained true to his position that "our pride, our culture, must not be based on a lie", and eventually his judgment was vindicated by a change in expert and public opinion.

Although his wife was a strong moral support in these conflicts, the impulse to seek truth everywhere was essentially his own character trait. How can we understand such a personality? How to explain the impulses to engage in so many fights, when his profession would have allowed him to lead a very peaceful and retired life? Masaryk did not derive any pleasure from the fight itself. He himself said that he "was afraid conflicts might arise", and that he "would rather have avoided them". "It is not true that I am a fighter by nature", he says in his own story, written by Karel Capek. I am sure that he was not mistaken about himself. There weren't either any motives resulting from an inferiority complex nor from an over-extension of his ego. Masaryk's physical appearance was that of a tall, slim, healthy and good-looking man who loved gymnastics and went horse back riding even past his eightieth birthday. His physical features combined with his intellectual and psychological characteristics to form a rare and harmoniously balanced individual. His scientific demand for truth and moral responsibility impelled him to use his intellectual and physical strength to stand against mistakes, fakes and all perpetrators of human injustices.

Masaryk was also characterized by a rather emotional nature. Consequently, as a moralist he wasn't a man who preached moral norms but love for man; as a religious thinker he was the opposite

of a theologian in his warm and personal religious feeling. The practical nature of Masaryk's character drove the sociologist, logician and epistemologist to become interested in the daily and political life of his people.

Masaryk was a hard worker. It was hard work that developed his inherently gifted personality into the spiritual and political leader of his country and one of Europe's outstanding spokesmen. His widespread interests and manifold activities obliged him to be efficient. Being pressed for time, Masaryk answered many communications through previously printed though personal postcards. The cards mentioned that he had little time and excused him for replying so curtly, and then went on to say approximately that he had received the letter from, and that his answer was He spoke German and English as well as he did his mother tongue, possessed an excellent command of Russian, spoke good Polish and Serb and I once heard him speak a slow but meticulous French with a French minister.

SHAPING THE NATION

The harmony of Masaryk's personality was reflected in the extraordinary harmony of his long life. His everyday life had its difficulties since he was often short of money, having exhausted his limited resources for some unexpected journey or public campaign, and his academic and scientific interests often competed for time with his political ones. But what a steady development and harmony in the man and his work from the time of his appointment to the Charles University in 1882 to his election to the presidency in 1918, and then to his death in 1937.

When he began his academic career as associate professor of philosophy and sociology, Czech scientific life was just beginning to free itself from German domination and Masaryk was its leading personality from the outset. He brought a new orientation and new stimuli to Czech thought, by lecturing on Hume, Comte, Spencer, J. S. Mill, Buckle and other English and French thinkers who had previously been neglected in the narrow German philosophical curriculum. He strongly influenced the historians by developing a Czech philosophy of history which emphasized humanitarianism and democracy. "Positively . . . our past had prepared us for democracy. The foundations of the modern humane and democratic ideal had been laid by our Hussite Reformation in which . . . the Bohemian Brotherhood Church was especially sig-

nificant, inasmuch as it surpassed in moral worth all the other Churches . . ." Masaryk stressed further Chelcicky's humanitarian doctrine, the ideal of universal peace proclaimed by the 15th century Czech king George Podebrod, the conception of humanity built upon education of the Czech Brethren bishop Comenius as well as the humanitarian spirit of the revivers of Czech nationalism in the 18th and 19th century.

Masaryk also deeply influenced Czech literature and literary history. He instigated the edition of a new Czech encyclopedia. His standards of scientific criticism, truthfulness and sincerity in all phases of public and private life influenced whole generations of young Czech leaders. His ideas were developed not only in the class room, but also through such scientific and literary journals as the "Atheneum" (since 1883) and the "New Era" (since 1893), which he founded to spread new ideas among the intellectuals. The daily newspaper "Time," organ of his political party, the Realists, influenced both intellectuals and the masses. Through all these means, Masaryk and his followers fought excessive national pride, prejudice and provincialism, and patriotic sentimentality, to replace them with emphasis on enlightened and reasonable love of the land and the people, and practical work to improve the conditions of the country.

Masaryk's party, the Realists, remained the smallest among Czech parties until the outbreak of the war. It was characterized by concern with the higher intellectual and moral values, and therefore developed something of an elite character which prevented it from easily drawing mass support. The role of the party in the national life was more that of a critical, rational, politically enlightening body than of a powerful political organization.

But Masaryk's influence on public life in Bohemia and Moravia transcended purely political questions. His emphasis on rational and scientific thinking, by nature opposed to dogmatisms of all kinds, had a primary influence on social developments in the country. His opposition to Catholic domination in the shaping of gymnasium curricula was the result of his deeply religious conviction that freedom of conscience and personal judgment should not be impaired by any group, least of all in the public schools. At the same time he opposed the shallow religious feelings of Catholic intellectuals, demanding a sincere religious life instead of formalistic rituals.

At the other end of the scale, Masaryk was also extremely critical of the growing Marxist dogma. His book on the subject, which was published in 1898, thoroughly refuted Marxian dialectical and historical materialism. He also strongly criticized Marx's amorality and lack of humanitarian values. Recognizing the impetus behind the workers' movement and the justice of their demands for better conditions, he thought the amoral Marxist doctrine could never be the answer to their wants. His criticism has been vividly illustrated by the development of the Soviet police state.

Being theoretically and practically strongly interested in democracy and having created his own theory of it, Masaryk taught the nation to accept democracy as the only modern and satisfactory way of public and private life, and also as the necessary continuation of the democratic and humanitarian tendencies of its history. Masaryk demanded strictly sincere, enlightened and honest politics. He castigated the small improbities and tricks of Czech political life. He asked with Havlíček, the most prominent Czech journalist of the 19th century, a "rational and honesty policy".

Masaryk's principles proved invaluable both during the fight for independence and during the sovereign existence of the Czechoslovak republic. Thirty-two years of Masaryk's public activity found the nation in 1914 fully prepared to fight for its independence and politically mature to enjoy it. His vital influence on education, which had always been highly developed and respected among the Czechs, had the result of developing a new generation of leaders and intellectuals who were more critical, more independent and more rational than their forefathers and many of their European contemporaries. They were well acquainted with the world's intellectual movements, morally responsible, self-confident, humanitarian and enlightened in outlook.

Masaryk's philosophical and moral analysis of Austria-Hungary, as well as his own strong personality, gave the nation fighting for her freedom an extraordinary power and endurance. After the war, Masaryk guided the development of the nation both theoretically and practically by becoming its spiritual and political leader during almost two decades when outside influence often threatened the principles of the new republic.

The supreme harmony of this process has been well characterized by Masaryk himself in Karel Capek's "Masaryk Tells His Story": "My personal satisfaction, if I may call it so, lies deeper: for as the

head of the state I relinquish nothing that I believed in and loved as a penniless student, a carping critic, a reforming politician; occupying a position of power, I do not seek for myself any other moral law or relationship to my fellowmen, to the nation, and the world than those which guided me before. I may say that office confirms and completes everything that I have believed, so that I have not needed to change one item of my faith in humanity and in democracy, in the search for truth, nor in the supreme moral and religious command to love men. I can still affirm with experience which I am continuously acquiring, that the same moral and ethical rule applies to the state, and those who administer it, as to the individual".

MASARYK'S PHILOSOPHY

Masaryk's philosophical thought was rich and deep. He analyzed the finest and most complicated problems of classic and modern philosophy, drawing from this analysis original and logical conclusions. But he never shaped his ideas into a well-organized system. His logical mind probably felt that this could be done only at the price of violating his logically straightforward thoughts.

Masaryk's philosophical starting point was Hume's critical thought. He accepted Hume but due to the Kantian influence he stressed more the creative abilities of the human mind. As against strict empiricism, Masaryk emphasized the autonomy of human reason and its ability to create general and abstract concepts from man's sensations, creating new knowledge by comparison, analysis and synthesis. Masaryk's positivistic tendencies were strengthened by the study of Comte's positivistic sociology. In general we can label Masaryk as a moderate rationalist.

Masaryk did not see it possible to make a final decision between the two opposite philosophical doctrines of idealism and realism. The existence of the outer world seemed to him more real than idealism would admit. But the real picture of the outer world is only approximately as it is given by our senses. Masaryk himself labels his standpoint as "critical realism".

Masaryk accepted the classification of sciences of Auguste Comte as the basis of his own system. He added psychology, replaced astronomy by mechanics, and developed the whole system to include the more specific scientific branches.

Masaryk avoided metaphysics. But being a deeply religious man, he was obliged to deal with certain metaphysical problems. His religion is based on a well-founded belief in God. He didn't accept any particular theological grounds for his belief, but kept it in full harmony with scientific knowledge. Masaryk's theism is a sort of scientific hypothesis, supported by reason (for instance, as being an answer to the organization of the nature); it seemed to him the simplest possible hypothesis and therefore the logically best one.

Ethics was for Masaryk perhaps the most attractive field of philosophy. Masaryk was a moralist. He accepted morality as the basis of religion. Man must see his fellow man in the perspective of eternity. The basic ethical command is love of man and humanity. Therefore he speaks of humanitism. Masaryk based his ethics on the Christian command "Love thy neighbor as thyself", but he went beyond the Christian conception of love. Searching for humanitarian ideals among modern thinkers, even Schopenhauer and Nietzsche, he formulated his humanitism as a non-sentimental love, an energetic, systematical, active, efficacious and hard-working love directed especially toward fellow men in everyday life. He recognized different degrees of love and neighborliness: first we love our family, then our friends, our nation, and then humanity as a whole. He recognized this idea as necessary and practical, and conceived patriotism as a noble and worthy political force, to be distinguished from immoral chauvinistic nationalism.

Masaryk stressed truthfulness under all conditions, honesty and bravery in carrying out humanitarian ideals. Justice was to him the "arithmetic of love". There is no distinction between private and public morals. "The ethical basis of all politics is humanity". "Morality is the groundwork of politics". "No state, no society can be managed without general recognition of the ethical basis of the state and of politics; and no state can long stand if it infringes the broad rules of human morality". "The notion that diplomacy is necessarily compounded of cunning is obsolete. Men are beginning to understand that between nations as between individuals falsehood is stupid, and that it complicates and retards matters needlessly. Even in politics the method of truth is the most practical".

The relation between individual and society, which was so passionately discussed in Masaryk's times, cannot be understood solely in terms of the concepts of collectivism and individualism. He con-

ceived that the individual and the people are mutually dependent. Outstanding individuals play a more important role in the life of society than the average man. He thought the problem to be how to secure the most desirable influence of the outstanding individual, whether he was a specialist or a genius, on the opinion of the masses, the masses being by no means the decisive historical force, and outstanding individuals being equally necessary. He therefore rejects communism as a form of collectivism, but accepts socialism as being compatible with individualism. He understands individualism as a striving for the development of the personality in society. Marx and Engels incorrectly suppressed the role of individual in favor of a radical socialism.

Communism's requirement of economic equality is, according to Masaryk, not an adequate solution to the problem of inequality. He refutes the idea of total economic equality and asks only economic and social justice. He is equally opposed to state socialism and to the economic centralism. He understands socialism as advocating a more just and righteous division of economic goods and seeking improvement of social organization. He is against income without work as well as against exploitation of the work of others. His standpoint may be labeled an individualistic or humanitarian socialism with a socialization that is gradual, well prepared and evolutionary.

He did not think that the struggle of proletarians and of capitalists and bourgeois had the great historical importance which Marx assigned to it. He saw more than two social classes; a large "middle-class" between the workers and property-owners, with much cooperation between both, based on many common interests.

He thought that the individual and the people must cooperate. This is a social form of Masaryk's "synergism". In epistemology synergism means to Masaryk the cooperation of the experience and of the reason leading to new knowledge. In reality Masaryk's thought displayed both a metaphysical and practical synergism. Masaryk's philosophy, as a whole, has therefore been called a philosophy of synergism.

Masaryk was deeply interested in socialism. He wrote a book to evaluate the philosophical, moral, political and economical principles of Marxism. He recognized the demands of more economic justice as being morally well founded. He is certain that the "social question" will be solved, but thought that Marx and Engels built

their ideology on erroneous principles. Masaryk rejected the dialectic method of Hegel and Marx. He opposed the idea of historical evolution being negation of negation, and argued that there is not only evolution by opposition, but also by gradual changes. He thought that Marx's philosophical materialism was equally lacking. Ideas are not only reflections of the material world; Marx's philosophical work itself proves that this is not true. On the contrary, ideas play an important role in history.

Economic conditions are not the only cause of historical changes. Economic materialism is so methodologically and philosophically primitive that it is unable to account for the great number and complex character of the social causes. Marx's philosophy is an eclectic system, using many ideas of previous thinkers. Though some of those ideas were "ripe" in Marx's time, he failed to be sufficiently critical to create out of them an organic synthesis. Marx's teaching that the concentration of the capital goes ahead until the proletariat takes it over from the hands of a small group of capitalists is a phantasy, constructed according to the law of opposition.

Masaryk also strongly objected to the amoral character of Marxist philosophy, especially as expressed in Marx's exclusive emphasis on economic values and his theory of revolution. Marx and Engels exceeded themselves when they emphasized the complete relativity of moral norms, claiming that they were dependent on the particular position of each class and nation. Masaryk believed that men agree on basic moral norms, and that the organization of society is as much dependent on its moral, as on its technical and economic organization. He believed that morality is a social reality, and points out that Marx himself in speaking of exploitation and equality refers to natural law, which has a clear moral meaning.

Masaryk also criticized as inadequate Marx's view that all economic value is derived solely from the amount of work put into an object. He criticized this proposition as well as Marx's theory of surplus value, by pointing out contributions of other factors besides labor to the production process. He thought that Marx's great value lay in the consistent emphasis with which he concerned himself with the work of small, average men whose contribution and importance to history had never before been pointed up as strongly as they should have been. It was Marx who showed the world the part played in society by the many small men doing small, inconspicuous and unexciting work in the factories and elsewhere.

But Masaryk criticized Marx for failing to reconcile the theory of revolution with his own conception of the meaning of work. Although he himself pointed out the decadence of the old romantic conceptions of great deeds done by great men, he himself refused dignity and importance to human work by leading men astray by dangling the giant mythus of the revolution in front of their eyes. Masaryk criticized Marx for forgetting that revolution is only a means and not an end in itself. Masaryk recognized that revolution is a gamble, "all or nothing", a last means to be used only when no others are possible. He understood that revolution is rarely creative, and at best realizes what has been prepared in previous years. The idea of revolution, of the minority against the majority, is an essentially aristocratic concept, and an admission of weakness and imperfection both on the part of society and the individual. The revolutionist is often a savage who is frightened by the increasing complexity of modern life, and the revolution itself is a primitive political form. Masaryk calls for steady and consistent work, for reformation as opposed to revolution. Without a "reformation of the heart and of the mind", without reform of thought and morality, it is impossible to remove evils by revolution. These were the thoughts that Masaryk expressed in 1898 toward the idea that the "social question" could be solved by the revolution of the proletariat. Masaryk realized that the aims and means of a revolution must themselves be morally evaluated, and this position was to lead to the development of his own revolutionary struggle against the Austrian empire.

Masaryk's most profound work was his study of Russia, published a year before the first world war. The first two volumes have never been followed by an analysis of Dostoevski which was supposed to be the most important part of the Russian study. The leader of the revolution, and later President of the Republic, never found time for it.

The "Spirit of Russia" is a thoroughgoing study of philosophical and literary currents in Russia. From their characteristics Masaryk drew general conclusions valid for the whole Russian society. The original title of the work (Russia and Europe) shows the basic position of Masaryk: Russia is an area different from the rest of Europe. The basic cause is that Europe overcame mediaeval theocracy through reformation, and in France and most other Catholic countries through revolution. Russia never had a reformation nor fully successful revolution, and maintains basic cultural characteristics

of the Byzantine middle ages. But "medieval Russia was dragged without transition into the European evolutionary process of the eighteenth and subsequent centuries". The Russian understands modern European thinking, but accepts it in the spirit of the middleages. Bakunin, for instance, desired to replace the false absolute of the orthodox church by the true and definite absolute. His belief in democracy was now a religion. In reality he and the Russian revolutionists never aspired to democracy. Russian anarchism was strong because of this same lack of cultural development. The Russians kept the middle ages characteristic passivity and lack of emphasis on assiduous and systematic work. Their leaders maintained the old aristocratic ideals, and were not influenced by Hume's and Kant's critical spirit. Masaryk didn't believe "that it is possible for Russia to skip certain stages of historical development, to pass without transition from a low state to a much higher one". The German protestants, who went through the lengthy transition from theology to science, were not as caught up by the crude materialism of Ficht and Feuerbach as were the Russians whose transition to modern scientific thought was too rapid and lacking in depth.

Masaryk's analysis of Russian thinking explains to a large extent the Bolshevik almost religious faith in Marx's materialism, and their failure to understand democracy.

THEORY OF DEMOCRACY

Democracy is not yet a reality even in most democratic states. Masaryk saw it as an ideal, a new life to be striven toward. "Democracy is not alone a form of state and of administration. It is philosophy of life and an outlook upon the world". It is not only a matter of a majority; it is a question of morality, science and culture, and this cannot be achieved by a democratic political system alone. The lives of all citizens, their mentality and culture are all part of a well-functioning democratic state.

Professor W. P. Warren says that Masaryk is "to be credited . . . with a comprehension of the functional nature of a democratic system which stands out among the political philosophies of history. Assuredly neither Rousseau nor Kant had so clear an understanding of the modus operandi of democracy, whereas modern states like America and France had thought of it too simply".

There are two roads which led Masaryk to his conception of democracy. The first is Jesus' supreme law of love for man. Democ-

racy is the only way to achieve political, economic and social justice and to realize man's love for man. "Democracy is the political form of the humane ideal" are the concluding words of his "The Making of a State". Secondly democracy is the necessary correlate of the modern scientific, moral and cultural development of mankind. In all those fields there is a continuous evolution towards the democratic forms of life. It is an evolution from theocracy and aristocracy to democracy, from theology and scholasticism to science and philosophy, from independent striving of the creative artist to modern socially functional artistic work. Not only political life, but also the science has become more democratic by an intensive popularization of its goals through general education. Religion has also become more democratic by doing away with the function of the priest, by dropping the ecclesiastical hierarchy as a necessary part to religiosity, and by replacing the revealed truths by personal religious experiences. Art has also become more democratic by creating and using subjects out of the everyday life of small men.

Democracy appears as the penetration of scientific and philosophical method into the political life. In democracy discussion takes the place of order and authority. Hence, Masaryk's definition: "Democracy is a discussion, a discussion basically similar to the scientific discussion". Democracy works by scientific methods and its tactics are therefore inductive, realistic, and empirical; theocratic aristocracy is deductive, unrealistic, fanciful and scholastic". True and full science is the very genius of democracy. It is non-arbitrary in all its methods in contrast to the arbitrariness of dictatorship and of absolute authority. Science, as well as scientific policy, depends on experience and induction. It can claim no infallibility. Democracy means use of the laborious and honest methods as they are used in science. Its aim is the knowledge of facts and of men and the finding of their best suited relationships and functions. The philosophic criticism is the archservant of democracy. From the moral point of view, democracy is the embodiment of ethical principles. Ethics is the basic reason for democracy. The function of democratic politics is . . . "to realize ethical principles on behalf of and in the social whole".

The well-known principles of the French revolution express for Masaryk the principles of modern democracy: equality, freedom, brotherhood. They are also just in Lincoln's "government of the people, by the people, and for the people." But both slogans raise a number of problems which have not been yet fully solved by democratic thinkers. Democratic evolution has to solve them gradually.

One problem is the amount of control over the government of a state to be given to the people. The people cannot directly govern a modern state, but they must have a voice in all matters of larger public interest. The question, therefore, is reduced to how the people can be heard and how influential their voice should be in a democratic state's politics. The enlightening of the masses and the developing of good leaders is of the highest importance in this respect. Both must be given a thoroughgoing fundamental education on their own levels. The people must be given enough education so that they are capable of judging the decisions of their leaders. Democracy at the same time requires the very highest degree of leadership. It cannot be sustained without educational, moral and political leaders who guide their people in seeking culture and truth. They must be true aristocrats of character, depth and wisdom, while they remain servants of the nation. Thus, democracy's main task, as conceived by Masaryk, is education.

Masaryk saw "equality" as another unsolved democratic problem. He took a broad position in this respect by asking "not merely political equality, but also economic, social, moral, religious, and spiritual, and intellectual equality generally". Since absolute equality is not possible, Masaryk thought we must achieve at least the most tolerable degree of inequality. Equality cannot mean equalization of individuals; the gifted individual must have the opportunity to develop and to assert himself. Democracy is based on individualism, but this should not lead to an overestimation of the individual. The "titanism", the worshipping of the outstanding or strong individual and giving him more moral rights is to be refused.

The requirement of maximum freedom for each individual raised the problem of coordination of multiple individual interests and of the harmonization of individual freedom and of the group-determination. This contributes by making democracy the most difficult of all political systems. But the elevation of man to a higher level of thinking and action will help make it work. It is "a mutual concession of liberty and its constitutional observance". The freedom of enlightened consciences is the only basic freedom men can have. Freedom requires the obligation of toleration. This democratic virtue is more suited to the relativity of scientific knowledge and method than was the absolutism of theological revelation. Democracy means the self-determination through enlightened and responsible leaders representing free men in a cultured milieu of equality and mutual respect. The individual's freedom means the

right to initiative and freedom, and initiative lead to personal responsibility. The individual and nobody else is fully responsible. The modern democrat does not conceal himself behind the church, state, nation, political party or even humanity as people have so often done. Freedom of public opinion and of the press is the basis of political freedom. This means freedom of criticism of the state administration as well as of individuals. Criticism is a scientific method as well as the foundation of democratic politics.

Democracy means freedom from autocracy, arbitrariness and violence. But logically enough it also means freedom from the violence of the lie. Macchiavellianism and Jesuitism are yet other forms of violence. Macchiavelli recommends violence of all kinds, amongst others also the lie. Loyola using immoral means for the benefit of the church also made use of lies—a dry kind of violence. Dostojewski falsely expected that Russia would come to truth through lies. Democracy must be truthful, democracy means to give up the habit of lying and mendacity.

"Democracy is a regime of work. . . . Democracy demands that all shall work". The democrat triumphs through physical and mental work over "the aristocratic ideal of indolence and violence". Democracy demands constant and positive detailed work. But "democracy aims, not merely at work, but at the spirit of industry". Work doesn't suppress the individuality of man but gives him the opportunity to express himself through it. The exploitation of individuals cannot be surmounted by the abolition of industrialism, but can be ameliorated by social morality and by a really democratic culture. Democracy is a principle of labor.

"Genuine democracy will be economic and social as well as political". Emphasis on group interests, of workers as well as of any other natural group, is implicit in the very structure of democracy; in democracy there is a sense of social solidarity. "I am not opposed to the socialization of a number of undertakings—socialization, not only nationalization or state control—of railways, canals, coal mines and means of communication. I can imagine a gradual, evolutionary socialization for which the ground would be prepared by the education of workmen and of leaders in trade and in industry".

Evolution is the real democratic method. Masaryk opposes revolution unless it is morally well founded. Only if there are no other means of defense against violence or if our spiritual or physical life

is threatened is revolution morally acceptable. Revolution as a necessary means of development towards democracy is equally well grounded. The real revolution is a reform revolution. But a "purely political revolution . . . in a democratic republic, is madness, a real crime against the interests of the working people".

Democratic culture is not only a matter of religion and morality, but also a question of technique. Masaryk devoted his attention also to this side of democracy. He discussed, for instance, the problems of bureaucracy, parliamentarism, and leadership. Even "the highest official is himself a free citizen, one of the people working for the people". Parliamentarism may give way to demagoguery, which is to be avoided by increasing the individual's responsibility and education, as well as by the gradual improvement of the democratic institutions. "Education and morality on the part of its [parliament's] members are essential postulates". Democracy "has a constant problem of leadership,—that is, it has to train and educate leaders".

"Outwardly, in foreign policy, the work of democracy is to organize and strengthen, by methods of friendship, relations between States and nations". "Democratic foreign policy all round means peace and freedom all round". The representatives of nations should be accredited to peoples, not merely to heads of states and . . . "a diplomatic envoy should uphold the interests and the policy of his country in the foreign Parliaments. Relations between States and nations might thus, in course of time, be usefully supplemented by interparliamentary intercourse".

INTERNATIONAL POLITICS

Masaryk's first real entrance into the field of international politics occurred shortly before the first World War when he openly challenged the Austrian foreign minister Aehrenthal and the anti-Serbian documents forged by his ministry. Soon afterwards, in 1912, he attempted a reconciliation between Serbia and Austria-Hungary, and the next year he tried to effect a Serbo-Bulgarian accord. But before his proposals could be carried out, conditions in the Balkans and Europe became so incendiary as to frustrate any efforts he might have made, and he was forced to focus his attention on the whole play of world forces in an effort to understand how these might effect possible changes in the European political patterns.

The Zagreb trial of the accused Serbians was closely connected with Masaryk's decision to fight against Austria-Hungary. The fact that the Austrian foreign ministry stooped to the forging of documents to implement its imperialistic plans, and would ruthlessly deal death sentences to dozens of innocent people, convinced him of the basic immorality and rottenness of the empire. He lost all hope that it would ever develop into a federalistic state which would give justice and true representations to the many nations who were then oppressed by the Hapsburg dynasty and the Austrian Germans and Magyars.

Masaryk was nevertheless very deliberate in preparing the struggle against the empire. He considered the question of the right of self-determination of the Czechs, Slovaks and other non-Germanic nations in the empire. He probed the problem of whether the Czechs were politically sufficiently mature to have an independent state, weighing the glorious past of a nation which had its own state until 1620 (theoretically till the present time) and the prophecy of the great Czech religious figure, Comenius who in his testament written in exile in Holland in 1670 said, "I too, believe before God that when the storms of wrath have passed, to thee shall return the rule over thine own things, O Czech people. Masaryk gave serious consideration to the moral right of revolution, and the moral duty to defend the political ideas for which so many Czechs were executed during the early months of the war. As a scientist he studied the economic and military capacities of the great powers, reading numerous works on modern strategy and war and making several trips to Holland, Switzerland, Italy and Germany.

When his moral and critical demands were satisfied, Masaryk, the individual, the fighter for truth, without money or appreciable influence, began the fight against the gigantic empire. Before leaving Bohemia he consulted leaders of the other Czech parties to get their silent approval, but the hardships and deprivations of the struggle were let entirely to him.

He opened his campaign with a philosophical public address on Jan Hus, the great Czech national and religious leader, which was given July 6th, 1915, in the Hall of Reformation in Geneva. Thus the celebration of the fifth centenary of Hus' martyrdom marks the starting-point of the birth of the new Czech state. Starting there, Masaryk initiated an intensive international propaganda campaign to arouse worldwide interest in the Czech and Slovak

cause, a project in which he was soon joined by Eduard Benes and Milan Stefánik. They gave information to newspapers, interviews, public lectures, reports on happenings inside the empire and on the doings of the Czech resistance which were published throughout the Allied countries. Masaryk made personal visits to France, Britain and later the United States. He gave valuable information to leading political figures; and he organized an efficient system which relayed information from inside Austria and Germany to the Allies. He also organized a successful campaign among Czechs in America, whose material and moral contributions were invaluable to the fight for the liberation of their father-land.

His first marked public success was his reception by the French Prime Minister, Aristide Briand, on February 3, 1916. He attempted to persuade him of the necessity of carrying through the dismemberment of Austria-Hungary. He reports in his memoirs that "Briand grasped the heart of the matter at once", and promised to carry out Masaryk's policy. The visit was reported in an official communiqué. President Wilson's declaration of November 6, 1916, with its emphasis on the rights of small nations to self-determination, was still another step toward his goal of achieving Czech independence. The decisive victory came when the Allies, in reply (January 16, 1917) to Wilson's demand to state their war aims, included the liberation of Italians, Slavs, Roumanians and Czechoslovaks from foreign rules as one of their prime points.

All this took place while Masaryk was visiting the organized Czech groups in the Allied capitals, coordinating their anti-Austrian activities and stimulating the enrollment of young men into the Allied armies. This enrollment occurred spontaneously in many countries, and was strongest in Russia, where there were many thousands of Czechs in the war prison camps. When the Czechs living in foreign lands were coordinated in the National Council of Czech Countries, Masaryk was elected its president (Nov. 1, 1916). These Czech army units grew in size steadily and by the end of the war had more than 128,000 troops under arms, many of whom proved their mettle under fire. On June 29, 1918, the French government recognized the National Council as the basis of the future Czech government, and the British extended similar recognition soon afterwards. And the United States, through the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, also recognized the National Council as the de facto Czechoslovak Government (August 23, 1918).

Through his wide-flung activities and contacts Masaryk became the leading figure among the spokesmen for all the minority groups who were hoping for independence from Austria. He formulated a joint political program with them, especially with the Yugoslavs, and together with them sought to fix the proper political and moral focus of their fight for independence. Wilson's Famous Fourteen Points strongly supported the cause of these nations, but the declaration did not go as far as Masaryk would have liked it to go. It asked only for the "autonomous development" of the people of Austria-Hungary and said nothing about political independence. As a result Masaryk visited the United States to consult with Wilson and after several talks persuaded him to accept his more radical point of view. The Czechoslovak Declaration of Independence, released by Masaryk on October 18, 1918, had the wholehearted support of Wilson, whose final answer to the Austrian plea for peace terms was the incentive for the Czech revolution of October 28. With this revolution and the subsequent treaties at Versailles a new state entered into European political life, and the professor who at the beginning had planned on his own and fought for its realization was, after four years of struggle, unanimously elected its first President on November 14th, 1918. He chose the old Hussite motto "Truth Prevails" as the official maxim of the new state.

Masaryk was probably the only European statesman whose war aims were clear and well defined from the very beginning of the war. The leaders of the allied countries fought because their countries were attacked or threatened, and only slowly developed some basic ideas on the reorganization of Europe. From the primary principle of breaking down the power of German and Austrian imperialism developed the need for the democratization of Europe, including recognition of the claims of the various minority peoples and groups in the old Hapsburg empire. Masaryk had from the very beginning fought for the dismemberment of that empire, which was finally effectuated with the creation of the independent states of Czechoslovakia and Poland, while various other minority territories were united with their national states.

It was largely Masaryk who persuaded Briand and the other European leaders to accept the large and revolutionary scope of this program. It was he who, in persuading Wilson to modify his Fourteen Points declaration, put the question of the Austrian minorities into world perspective. And it was Masaryk who issued what was in effect the statement of final Allied war aims in Europe, pub-

lishing a 34-point well-founded program entitled *The New Europe*. This clear and unambiguous statement of war aims, drafted more than a year before the end of the war, was in its systematic development of moral and political claims probably the most deeply meaningful of many such annunciations.

Masaryk wrote in *The New Europe* that the end of the war would see the beginning of a new epoch in the history of European development, with the remnants of the old German, Austrian and Turkish feudal theocracies to be replaced by modern democratic regimes. He hoped that the war settlements would give the final death-blow to the remnants of the medieval cesaro-papism, the big autocratic dynasties who had been weaned by the church and were oppressing so many nations in the boundaries of their states. He conceived pan-Germanism as representing in Prussian terms the medieval conception of the state combined with the principles of modern imperialism and militarism, and warned that safeguards were needed to protect small Eastern neighbors of the German nation from Germany's *Drang Nach Osten*. Germany was not to be allowed to dominate them and both her and Austria's boundaries were to be fixed by their national borders, although he did not rule out a possible union between the two German-speaking countries.

The basis of his proposals called for the removal of existing discrepancies between state and ethnographic boundaries in Europe. States are to be created according to their national boundaries. Where the existing ethnographic boundaries are not clear, the national minorities are to be as small as possible.

The application of this principle meant that in addition to the above effects, the Poles would get Posen, Danzig and Prussian Silesia; the Luzatians (should they so wish) are to be joined to Czechoslovakia; Alsace-Lorraine was to be united with France, and Schleswig-Holstein with Denmark. In addition, Italy would receive the Italian territories in Austria, and Trieste would become a free port. Russia would give up the Polish territories and would organize itself into a federated state, the Ukraine being an autonomous part therein.

Masaryk felt that the peace treaty should guarantee the rights of those national minorities who would be left behind, and to establish permanent principles for eugenic supervision. He also thought that the League of Nations should foster the cultural development of the new nations and encourage international reciprocity toward

the end of a closer union among the various states. It was in voluntary federation that Masaryk put his hopes for the small countries achieving a political unity which had formerly been falsely maintained in the corrupt and unnatural empire.

He further felt that the old diplomatic rule, that states must not interfere in the internal affairs of other states, should not be followed in the coming peace negotiations. Masaryk thought that political boundaries should not be allowed to be a shield for arbitrary actions, that secret agreements were to be avoided, that standing armies were to be replaced by militia, and that navigation and commerce were to be free, except that commerce and industry were to be protected against unfair competition by international agreement. Most of Masaryk's points were finally written into the peace treaty, including many not mentioned here. Some of those not accepted seem very much needed today, especially the concept of not allowing political boundaries to protect arbitrary actions, which Masaryk aimed at Austria-Hungary, but which is even more applicable today to the case of Russia and her satellites.

At any rate the outcome and results of the war proved a full and almost incredible fulfillment of Masaryk's original political aims, which he had proclaimed from the very beginning of the conflict. Professor Charles Sarolea characterized excellently the wide scope of his success in a following appraisal: "That an old teacher of philosophy, without money, without political influence, without any official following, should have imposed upon himself the duty and mission of challenging the might and majesty of the Hapsburg empire at the very moment when the armies of the Central Powers were carrying everything before them and seemed to be victorious on every front, that this old man should have conceived the plan of restoring the Bohemian state which had been wiped out off the map of Europe since the battle of the White Mountain in 1620 and of further uniting that resurrected Bohemian state with Slovakian territories which, for a thousand years, had lived under Hungarian dominance, must have appeared to every sober-minded English politician as a manifest proof of lunacy. And that this same old scholar, undeterred by the cynical scepticism of the wise and the indifference of the ignorant, should have proceeded to carry out his wild schemes, that he should have succeeded in converting to those schemes the very statesmen and diplomats who have been most persistently hostile and that, in the fullness of time he should have made his fantastic dream into a living reality, will always appear to

future generations as the most astounding miracle of modern political history". Prof. W. P. Warren rightly accepts this newspaper appraisal as his own standpoint in his book, "Masaryk's Democracy".

A more careful examination of this "astounding miracle" shows clearly that it was due to natural causes. The basic condition was the outbreak of the European war and the victory of Allied armies, but the rest can be traced to the unusual character of Thomas Garrigue Masaryk. His long, scientific, educational and moral training of the nation, his unique political responsibility and knowledge, his scientific approach to political problems and their analysis, and finally, his intellectual and moral consistency were prime factors in Czechoslovakia's struggle for independence. If the degree to which Masaryk combined these characteristics can be considered miraculous, then Masaryk's success can be considered a miracle. If we consider his personal characteristics as human and humanly achievable, then we will speak only of perfect human achievement. That is the way I understand Masaryk. If viewed in this light, the achievements of his long presidency and his creation of a model democracy on the ruins of a semi-feudal empire appear only as great human accomplishments.

Under Masaryk's leadership Czechoslovakia became a model democratic state, and finally was the only democracy in central Europe. When all the neighbor's republics succumbed to Fascist rule, Czechoslovakia remained a democracy until it was destroyed by Hitler. Masaryk's spirit was so strong that the democratic regime rose again after the defeat of Germany, until it was again forcefully annihilated by Russian Bolshevism, with the help of the Czech communists.

But Masaryk's spirit still lives in Czechoslovakia. It is as strong as it was during his lifetime and it is strengthening continuously after the horrible experiences with the communist regime. Many who temporarily saw in communism a new creed, come back to appreciate Masaryk's democracy. What Masaryk wrote in his "Spirit of Russia", "Making of a State", in his articles about Bolshevism and what he said in his public speeches as President proved to be more true than anybody could surmise thirty or more years ago. "... in Russia there is neither communism nor socialism, simply because the Russian people are not educated for socialism" ... In our country "we need ways, methods of work and of social reforms suiting our conditions and needs. The Russian method doesn't suit

us". 1920.) "The Bolsheviks' lack of scientific probity, referring always to the early period of Marx's writings". "Marx didn't think of a dictatorship as realized by Bolsheviks". "They realize a dictatorship being a kind of terrorism". "In reality it is a dictatorship over the proletarians". "The trial failed and cannot succeed because briefly the Bolsheviks are not on the level of human civilization". (1922.)

If we think of Masaryk's personality and achievements today we feel unconsciously how inspiring a model he is for us. We are inspired by his knowledge and by his approach to the problems of the time. His analysis of Russia and communism is as true today as it was in his time. His method of evaluating the situation by scientific methods and from moral standpoints, and of fighting unhesitatingly as soon as he recognized the truth, is sorely needed in the world today. He succeeded in what seemed at first a hopelessly one-sided struggle, because he approached the problem in this straight-forward manner, with the result that the moral forces of the world organized and helped him win. We are certain that the moral forces which are strong in the world today will gather to the aid of truth, and arriving at a clear understanding of their position, will make "the truth prevail".

CHIEF WORKS OF T. G. MASARYK

- Der Selbstmord als Soziale Massenerscheinung der Modernen Civilisation*, Carl Konegen, Vienna, 1881
- David Hume's Skepsis und Wahrscheinlichkeitsrechnung*, Carl Konegen, Vienna, 1884
- Versuch Einer Concreten Logik*, Carl Konegen, Vienna, 1887
- Naše nynější krise* (Our Present Crisis), Praha, 1895
- Ceská Otázka* (The Czech Question), Cas, Praha, 1895
- Jan Hus*, Praha, 1896
- Karel Havlíček*, Jan Laichter, Praha, 1896
- The Modern Man and Religion*, Allen and Unwin, Ltd., London, 1938 (Czech edition, 1897)
- Die Philosophischen and Soziologischen Grundlagen des Marxismus*, Carl Konegen, Vienna, 1898 (Czech edition, 1898)
- Ideals of Humanity*, Allen and Unwin, Ltd., London, 1938 (Czech edition, 1902)
- Národnostní filosofie doby novější* (Modern National Philosophy), Jičín, Praha, 1905
- The Spirit of Russia*, Allen and Unwin, Ltd., London, 1919 (German edition, 1913)
- The New Europe*, Eyre and Spottiswoode, Ltd., London, 1918
- Sur le Bolshevisme*, Sonor, Geneva, 1921
- Les Problèmes de la Démocratie*, Marcel Rivière, Paris, 1924
- The Making of a State*, F. A. Stokes Co., New York, 1927 (Czech edition, 1925)

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Beneš Edvard, *Masaryk's Path and Legacy*, Orbis, Praha, 1937
- Capek Karel, *Masaryk on Thought and Life, Conversations with Karel Capek*, Macmillan Co., New York, 1938
- Capek Karel, *President Masaryk Tells His Story*, Allen and Unwin, Ltd., London, 1934
- Eubank E. E., *T. G. Masaryk: Sociologist*, Social Forces, 1938, pp. 455-462
- Fournier-Fabre, Émile, *La Vie et L'Oeuvre Politique et Sociale de M. Thomas Garrigue Masaryk*, G. Ficker, Paris, 1927
- Herben Jan, *Thomas G. Masaryk*, Czechoslovak Foreign Office, Praha, 1919
- Herben-Hartl-Bláha, *T. G. Masaryk: sa Vie, sa Politique, sa Philosophie*, Orbis, Praha, 1923
- Jakowenko Boris, *Festschrift Th. G. Masaryk zum 80. Geburtstag, 7 März 1930*, Fridrich Cohen, Bonn, 1930
- Lowrie Donald, *Masaryk: Nation Builder*, Association Press, New York, 1930
- Ludwig Emil, *Defender of Democracy*, Robert M. McBride Co., New York, 1936
- Nejedlý Zdeněk, *T. G. Masaryk*, Melantrich, Praha, 1930
- Salda F. X., *Masaryk: Staatsman und Denker*, Orbis, Praha, 1930
- Sarolea Charles, *President Masaryk and the Spirit of Abraham Lincoln*, Orbis, Praha, 1921
- Street C. J. C., *President Masaryk*, Geoffrey Bles, London, 1930
- Sychrava Lev, *T. G. Masaryk, 1850-1930*, Orbis, Praha, 1930
- Utitz Emil, *Masaryk als Volkserzieher, 1850-1935*, Orbis, Praha, 1935
- Warren W. Preston, *Masaryk's Democracy, A Philosophy of Scientific and Moral Culture*, Univ. of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill, 1941
- Werner, Arthur, *Th. G. Masaryk: Bild seines Lebens*, Rolan Verlag Moravitz, Praha, 1934